DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 961 EA 020 702

AUTHOR Murphy, Joseph
TITLE Instructional Improvement and the Control of Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Educational Assessment; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Power Structure; *School Effectiveness; School Role; School Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews, in two parts, discoveries about control in 12 instructionally effective school districts (IESD) in California. In part one, after describing six ways to view administrative control, this report provides a brief description of the study, presents findings on the use of selected control mechanisms, and reviews what was learned about the the dynamics of control and empowerment in these districts. Part two consists of a discussion concerning the methodological problems in studies of control in educational organizations. The conclusion notes a need to view control and empowerment as interrelated, not opposite constructs. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302961

Instructional Improvement and The Control of Schools

DRAFT

Joseph Murphy

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association

April 1988 New Orleans

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Murphy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 702

In the current era of educational reform the issue of the control of professional staff members in schools is receiving a good deal of attention. Reformers tend to fall into one of two camps--advocates for increased management control and supporters of efforts to empower professionals (and sometimes parents). The substantive positions of each group are supported by underlying sets of values and beliefs and references to selected areas of research.

From studies of effective schools and effective educational leaders advocates for greater control draw support for the re-centralization of schools and the need for increased managerial control (see for example Murphy & Hallinger, 1986). This research is buttressed by a neo-rational value system that is beginning to view loose coupling in schools as dysfunctional (see for example, Lutz, 1982; Murphy, Mesa, & Hallinger, 1985).

Advocates for the empowerment of professionals and parents find support in studies of program implementation, successful staff development, and school improvement. The economic and political values inherent in local choice (see Campbell, 19__) combine with the tenets of professionalism to corroborate the need for empowerment (see Holmes Group, 1986). Supporting all this are rather quite well-developed attacks on the dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy (Downs, 1967; Frymier, 1987), legislated educational mandates (Wise, 1979), and school administrators (Holmes Group, 1986).

One thing about the debate on control and empowerment is especially enlightening--advocates for both sides often appear unable to see beyond the value structure with which they enter the discussion. In the worst case this leads to the search for evidence to confirm existing beliefs. Advocates of control are particularly prone to believing and seeing (see Lotto, 1983a for a discussion). In a second scenario, advocates for one

position thoroughly review the problems and absurdities associated with the other point of view and then make the undocumented leap, based on their own beliefs, that their position, juxtaposed to the discredited system, must be correct.

In this paper I review what we discovered about control in our study of twelve instructionally effective school districts (IESD) in California.* After sketching out six ways of viewing administrative control, I provide a brief description of the study, present findings on the use of selected control mechanisms, and then review what we learned about the dynamics between control and empowerment in these districts. In the second part of the paper I discuss some of the methodological problems in studies of control in educational organizations. I conclude with a note on the need to view control and empowerment as interrelated, not opposite constructs.

Typologies of Administrative Control

Organizational control in schools can be viewed from several perspectives. Six of these are briefly noted below.

Internal-External (Owens, 1984). The source of the control mechanism is the primary characteristic in this perspective. Control is exercised both by people within the organization, e.g., the superintendent, and by actors external to it, e.g., textbook publishers and test developers. The internal-external view of control surfaced with the open systems movement in organizational theory. Expanding understanding of internal activity by

---

*I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues on the original study, Philip Hallinger and Kent D. Peterson.

examining environmental forces external to the organization has been a major contribution to organizational analysis.

Hierarchical-Nonhierarchical (Lortie, 1969; Peterson, 1983). Where the control mechanisms originate is the critical aspect of this view of control. As Peterson (1984a) has noted with reference to controls, "Hierarchical ones are controlled by or emanate from upper level administrators. They are bureaucratic in nature, providing specific constraints over subordinates. Nonhierarchical controls emanate from outside the superior" (p. 7).

Formal-Informal (Murphy, 1978). Formal and informal control mechanisms are closely related to the hierarchical and nonhierarchical dimension. In this view, however, the key element is whether the control mechanism is a product of the formal organizational system, either planned or as a by-product of systems operations, or part of structures that have evolved within the formal systems but are independent from them. In the former case they are formal controls and in the latter informal controls.

Structural-Activity (Meyer & Rowan, 1975; Lortie, 1969). In this perspective, the critical element is the type of organizational activity that is controlled. Studies of organizations (Meyer & Rowan, 1975; Lortie, 1969), of administrative control in schools and districts (Cohen & Miller, 1980; Peterson, 1983; Crowson & Morris, 1984), and of administrative work activities (Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79; Peterson, 1978; Pitner, 1982; Sproull, 1981) have all noted that administrative control in most schools and districts focuses on activities, tasks, and processes peripheral to the technical core of the schools. That is, finance and pupil behavior are more tightly controlled than curriculum and instruction (see particularly, Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79).

Bureaucratic-Professional (Lortie, 1969; 1975; Murphy, 1978). As with the internal-external typology, the essential element here is the source of the control mechanism. Bureaucratic controls have many of the same properties as hierarchical controls. In contrast, professional controls are those that emanate from education in training institutions and association groups. Principal behavior is controlled by professional norms directly through their own training and associations, e.g., the emerging norm of instructional leadership, and indirectly by teacher professional norms, e.g., accepted professional practices in the area of mainstreaming.

Direct-Indirect (Duckworth, 1981; 1983; Murphy, Hallinger, Weil, & Mitman, 1983; Owens, 1984). According to Owens (1984), the key ingredient in the direct-indirect perspective is the nature of the mechanism. Direct controls are those which are designed to influence the behavior and activities of staff members. Indirect controls constrain and form organizational conditions, policies, and practices that are designed to influence staff by controlling the work structures, processes, or task arrangements of individuals.

Control in Effective School Districts

Description of the Study

Control framework. In the Summer of 1984 I completed data collection activities in twelve IESD in California. These districts (5 elementary, 3 high school, and 4 unified) were the most effective in California in promoting high levels of student achievement, after controlling for socio-economic status, on standardized tests in reading, mathematics, and language. The goal was to examine administrative control between the district and school/classroom levels. Based on knowledge of control in

organizations in general and schools specifically (Ouchi, 1979; Lortie, Crow, & Prolman, 1983; and especially Peterson, 1984b) and findings about the characteristics of effective educational organizations (Purkey & Smith, 1983), a conceptual framework of nine control functions--selection, socialization, supervision, evaluation, rewards/sanctions, goals, resource allocations, behavior controls, and technological specifications (see Figure 1)--was developed. The framework is an example from perspective number 6 in the control typologies reviewed earlier. The first five are "direct functions" which are designed to influence the behavior and activities of principals. The remaining four are "indirect functions." These controls are designed to constrain and form organizational structures, policies, and practices that influence the principal by controlling work conditions, processes, or task arrangements. Control functions, both direct and indirect, are posited to affect student outcomes by influencing two intervening variables--the culture and technology (curriculum and instruction) of schools.

--Insert Figure 1 about here--

Three research questions guided this study of administrative control. First, what types of controls are used in each of the nine functions to influence the activities of principals? Second, within each function and across functions are patterns of administrative control evident among sample districts? Third, how do the control mechanisms used in effective districts differ in pattern and form from those reportedly used in "average" districts?

Data collection, reduction, and analysis. A scheduled standardized interview instrument was developed to assess district level administrative control of principals. The protocol was designed to be used with the

superintendent of schools. Questions were primarily open-ended and were organized under the nine control functions in Figure 1. Interviews were conducted with the superintendents of each of the 12 districts in their offices during July 1984.

In addition to the interviews, districts provided the following archival data: district goal statements, principal evaluation forms, samples of evaluations of principals, district newsletters for the 1983-84 school year, and agendas and minutes from the principals' meetings from the 1983-84 school year.

Miles and Huberman (1984b) present a variety of methods for reducing and displaying qualitative data. Three of the methods they discuss were used in this study--summary sheets, memoing, and coding. Summary sheets containing impressions on each site were completed during debriefing sessions following each interview. In addition, initial information was recorded about patterns and differences among districts in the use of control mechanisms. According to Miles and Huberman (1984a), "the memo is a brief conceptual look at some aspect of the accumulating data set: an insight, a puzzle, a category, an emerging explanation, a striking event" (p. 25). Memoing was used throughout the course of the study. Coding was used primarily to divide districts into various categories (e.g., those in which statements of goals and objectives formed the content for principal evaluations versus those in which evaluation content focused on job descriptions).

Data was displayed on a conceptually clustered matrix for further analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1948b). The columns contained information on each district. Districts were grouped by type (elementary, high school, unified) and within type by size (number of schools in the district). The rows contained the nine control functions. The actual questions used in the

interviews were listed under each function. Information entered on the matrix was either direct excerpts from superintendent responses or information paraphrased and recorded by the researchers during the interviews.

Two approaches were used in analyzing the data. To begin with, each superintendent interview was analyzed individually across all the control functions to determine themes, factors, and characteristics of control which emerged in that specific district. Next, the 12 district portraits were examined as a group to determine if themes of control were evident across the sample. In the second phase of the analysis, each separate control function was examined across 12 districts. Once the nine horizontal slices across the twelve districts were made to review for consistency of themes within control functions, a vertical analysis of those themes was made. The richness of the responses to the open-ended questions provided data on a number of themes and facilitated the development of a number of typologies.

Results on the Nature of Control

A number of patterns emerge as findings within and across control functions are reviewed. In this section I briefly discuss these themes within the following seven categories: extent, focus, variety, pervasiveness, interlocking nature, directiveness, and centrality of the superintendent.

Extent. One of the most important findings of this preliminary study is that there appears to be more district level control of principal behavior and site-level activity than previous research has indicated (see especially Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79; Peterson, 1983). In other words, these IESD appear to be more tightly coordinated and controlled than many districts. Although I am unable to conclude that this control is associated

with the high level of student achievement in these districts, it would seem that further analysis of this possibility would be appropriate. Especially needed are validation studies using multi-level designs.

Focus. A second finding of importance is that there is considerable district level attention to technical core issues in these effective districts. Previous studies concluded that attention to the coordination and control of instruction and curriculum was conspicuous by its absence in most schools and districts (Deal & Celotti, 1977; Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79; Morris, Crowson, Porter-Gehrie, & Hurwitz, 1984). The prevalence of the technical core as an emphasized zone of control in these districts is consistent with findings from earlier work on effective schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1985). In general, much work needs to be done to examine zones of control emphasized in different districts. Specifically, it would appear that more indepth analysis of how districts coordinate and control technical core activities would be fruitful (see Rowan, 1983).

Variety. Districts in this study relied upon a wide range of control mechanisms, both direct and indirect, to shape administrative activity at the school level. My original belief that effective districts would rely more heavily upon direct than indirect control functions was not supported. All control functions, with the exception of behavior control, appeared to be prevalent in these districts. Given the loosely coupled nature of many districts, it is possible that central offices will need to develop multiple control mechanisms if linkages to schools are to be effectively established. In addition to examining this proposition, additional research should begin to examine interaction effects among the control functions and possible hierarchial ordering of control functions in relation to promoting varying combinations of district goals.

Pervasiveness. Control functions in these districts appear to be pervasive. This is consistent with earlier research on district control functions (Peterson, 1983). That is, control mechanisms were not limited or bunched in a single phase of activity, but were prevalent in input, throughput, and output phases of school operations. For example, administrative internships and structured selection procedures were used to socialize new administrators. Objectives at the school level were required to be aligned with district goals and examinations of progress on these objectives were frequently made. Curricular expectations, textbooks, tests, and instructional approaches were often dictated at the district level. In addition, outputs seemed to be subject to more analysis in these districts than they are in many districts. A number of authors have argued that effective districts can best be promoted by concentrating district control at the input (goals) and output (evaluation) phases of school operations (see especially Finn, 1983). Preliminary findings from this study would suggest that more attention should be devoted to examining the district control mechanisms in the throughput phase of operations as well.

Interlocking nature. One of the findings of special importance is the extent to which the various control functions are interwoven. The overall schema that results from a review of the control functions is one of connectedness rather than the compilation of isolated factors. A few of the functions greatly facilitated the operation of other control mechanisms. For example, goals drove the supervision and evaluation functions. Other functions supported the implementation of control mechanisms. For example, budget controls often supported district level control of technical core activities. In addition, important topics tended to appear in and be reinforced by a variety of control functions. There was a preferred model of instruction that was an important control mechanism in its own right in

nine districts. However, it also reappeared in and was supported by a variety of other control mechanisms. For example, the selection, training, supervision, and evaluation of staff were all based at least partially on the preferred model of instruction. Preliminary evidence leads me to believe that consistency and coordination among control functions may have been a key to the effectiveness of these districts.

Directiveness. Two tests of the control functions seem especially important. First, did they work; did they control administrative behavior and form viable connections between central offices and schools? Second, were they related to district effectiveness as defined in this study? Although I am unable to draw any strong inferences about the relationship between control patterns and district effectiveness, the fact that the patterns of control found in this study differ from those found elsewhere does provide some direction for further investigations and a sense of excitement that the path may lead to useful results.

Although the answer to the first question must be tempered in light of the study limitations (see Murphy, Peterson, & Hallinger, 1986), the evidence gathered suggests that the control mechanisms may be influencing site-level activity and administrative behavior. The results from the following control functions--staff development, supervision, evaluation, and goals--lend the most concrete support to this conclusion.

Centrality of the superintendent. In general, the superintendents of these IESO played a key role in connecting schools and district offices. In almost all the districts studied they were the hub and the glue that kept the various organizational components united. They seemed to exercise leadership patterns that brought focus and meaning to potential control functions, e.g., goals, supervision. They also exercised the specific behaviors, e.g., site visits to schools, regular review of principals'

objectives, that actualized many of the control mechanisms. It may be possible that strong centrality of direction is needed to insure the development and use of control functions in loosely coupled organizations like school districts. Furthermore, it may be that superintendents by the nature of the formal roles they hold in the organization are in the best position to provide this centrality of purpose. This proposition is consistent with the finding that superintendents are key actors in successful school improvement efforts (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984). In any case, it is difficult to ignore the strong role played by the superintendents in these districts in linking schools and district offices.

Summary. Peterson (1983) in his work on the coordination of the activities of principals by district offices developed the concept of "web of control." The ideas embedded in that concept are twofold. First, a number of weak or low-level controls can add up to form a state of tighter control than might be expected by simply looking at the parts. Second, regardless of strength, controls when viewed as a group are often likely to exert more influence than the sum of the parts. In this study I found evidence that strong webs of control constrain and shape the behavior of principals and others at school sites. Controls were pervasive throughout these districts and appeared to exert considerable direction over school level operations in general and technical core activities specifically. I also found that the superintendent seemed to occupy a central position both in terms of the development and effective functioning of this interlocking web of control.

Results on the Balance Between Control and Empowerment

One of the interesting aspects of these IESD was the extent to which there was a balance or "dynamic tension" between what appear to be opposite

organizational elements, e.g., between district control and professional autonomy. In order to provide a more complete picture of some of the complexity found in these districts, to temper any monolithic perspective of district control, and to shed some light on what seems to be a balance between control and empowerment, four of the more significant of these "dynamic tensions" are discussed below.

Rationality without bureaucracy. It would be appropriate, at least in comparison with many other school systems, to regard these IESD as rational systems. There was clear purpose, a sense of efficacy that the curriculum and instructional approaches emphasized could promote student learning, and patterns of outcome inspection and accountability--for example, there was approximately a 15 percent turnover in principals in these districts during the last five years because of inadequate job performance. At the same time, I found little evidence of the bureaucratic rigidity that often accompanies rational systems. An example will help illustrate this point. On a scale of 1 (not much) to 10 (a great deal) superintendents in these IESD rated district goal influence over school site activities at 8.0. On the other hand, the amount of reports principals needed to complete for district office personnel was rated at 3.8 and the extent to which what principals actually did was controlled by district office rules and procedures received a rating of 4.6. Although there was substantial evidence that the rational elements in these school systems were a product of district control, the elements appeared to work because these systems were living, adaptive organisms rather than collections of codified procedures. Even when systems, rules, and procedures were used, they did not appear to have displaced the purpose for which they were established.

Structured district control with school autonomy. There was a substantial amount of district level direction in these school systems. There was a high degree of district control over school level activities, especially in those areas most often delegated (by default) to schools. Finally, there was a large amount of forced consistency between schools in these districts. In short, I found these IESD to be more structured and controlled than I anticipated from my work in districts and reviews of the relevant literature. Yet the superintendents themselves often spoke of the autonomy and flexibility they granted to principals and schools. To a certain extent this can be explained because "autonomy" lies in the eye of the beholder. However, in a more real sense, these opposites exist in "dynamic tension" in these IESD. One way this tension played out was in the "funneled decision making" processes used in these school systems. Decisions in these districts tended to follow a pattern in which large openings for input and implementation narrowed considerably as decisions on goals and evaluations of outcomes were made. District influence was evident throughout. However, tight control was most noticeable at the narrowed parts of the funnel where decisions were made and outcomes were inspected. Greater autonomy for schools was evident in the input and implementation stages of the decision process.

Systems perspective with people orientation. It was evident that the achievement of district and school goals and the maintenance of organizational systems were the major concerns of superintendents in these districts. Personal goals of staff were not allowed to displace system goals. Administrator-teacher accommodations (see Murphy, Hallinger, Lotto, & Miller, 1987) and teacher-student accommodations (see Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986) were not made at the

expense of student learning. Yet within this framework of purpose, expectations, and control, there was evidence that staff needs were recognized and attended to. Superintendents spent time in schools developing a sense of organizational identity among their staffs. They sometimes were able to attend to special requests of teachers during visits. Superintendents spent considerable amounts of time in individual meetings with their principals--for example, seven of them met individually with their principals more than 25 times each year. Principals were more likely to be hired for their "people skills" in these IESD than for any factor other than curricular and instructional expertise. They were more likely to be terminated for lack of "people skills" than for any other single cause.

Strong leadership with an active administrative team. Strong leadership and control are not inconsistent with collaborative methods of operation. Unfortunately, many educators assume that discussions of increased control in schools augur a return to the "dinosaur school of management." That this need not be the case was evident in these IESD. The superintendents in these districts were generally powerful chief executive officers. They did not shy away from exercising control, making decisions, or resolving problems. On the other hand, they consciously culled and used the professional expertise of their administrative staffs. They consistently mentioned their reliance on the collective knowledge and judgment of their administrative colleagues and each had specific methods for tapping into that expertise.

Methodological Issues in the Study of Control

One of the conclusions that many studies of organizational control in schools reach is that there is not much of it across layers in the organization, i.e., between superintendents and principals (Hannaway & Sproull, 1978-79; Morris, et al., 1984) or between principals and teachers (Deal & Celotti, 1977; Hanson, 1981), especially in technical core areas. I believe that this conclusion is inaccurate (see for example Crowson and Morris' reanalysis of their earlier data, 1984) and owes its durability as much to the methodological strategies employed in examining (and not examining) control as to objective evidence. Specifically, I argue that by applying job analysis strategies to the measurement of control, researchers often fail to take into consideration elements of the school organization that heavily constrain and direct the activities of individuals.

Relying on a job analysis approach to analyze control is fraught with difficulties. Campbell (1981) reports that this "engineering approach" ignores a host of disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and political science that inform us about the meaning of behavior in organizations. Defining and assessing control in terms of particular behaviors has led to important problems in the control literature. To begin with, there is a tendency in the research to examine behaviors in isolation, to assume that they are additive, and to claim that they have similar effects regardless of the situation or context. Unfortunately, related but more advanced research studies in the areas of teacher and classroom effects (see especially, Marshall & Weinstein, 1984; Mitman, 1985) should lead researchers to question these assumptions. It is important to remember that school organizations are dynamic systems and that behaviors can be fully understood only within the context of specific organizations.

Furthermore, studies that rely on job analysis and that define control as the sum of individual behaviors generally underestimate the amount of control activities performed by school administrators. This occurs because these studies focus on behaviors that are directly observable, visible in the short term, and in close proximity to the consequent action or effect. In turn, the following types of potential control activities tend to be either missed entirely or severely undervalued in these studies: (1) indirect activities, (2) conceptual domain defining events (for example, establishing mission and expectations); (3) "organizational conditions" (Miles, 1983, p. 16), "embedded organizational structures" (Murphy, 1986, p. 127), and policy formulations; (4) symbolic and cultural activities, especially those with indirect or distal connections to the behavior of subordinates (see Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Pitner & Ogawa, 1981; Sergiovanni, 1982; 1984; Wimpelberg, 1986); (5) established organizational conditions that act as substitutes for control; and (6) organizational routines that encourage rather than direct staff to act in certain ways (see especially Crowson & Morris, 1984).

In addition to distortion in the measurement of control resulting from the narrow foci of job analysis studies (i.e., superiors' behaviors connecting directly to subordinates' behaviors, short-term emphasis), the tendency of investigations to equate all behaviors on the basis of time required to perform them can also lead to an underestimation of control. For example, it can be argued that certain activities that administrators can perform in a relatively short period of time (e.g., establishing policies that increase the academic rigor of student course loads) may exert considerably more control over teachers and students than do other more labor intensive activities (e.g., observing in classrooms; DeBevoise, 1982; Duckworth, 1981; 1983; Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Murphy, Hull, & Walker,

1987). In short, a few rather widely applicable policy initiatives or highly visible facilitative actions may be much more indicative of control than a plethora of more concrete and directly observable behaviors. Research that focuses primarily on behaviors often ignores policy as an aspect of control.

What is particularly troubling about the three assessment problems discussed above is that we know that a fair amount of the control provided by school administrators appears to be of the type not measured by job analysis studies (Dwyer, 1984; Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Guzzetti & Martin, 1986; Pitner, 1986). In addition, principals themselves report that they rely primarily on informal, indirect, and facilitative strategies as means of shaping and directing the behaviors of teachers (Guzzetti & Martin, 1986; see also Duckworth, 1981; 1983). The more we continue to define control only in behavioral terms, the more we will continue to underestimate the amount of direction provided by school administrators in schools.

There is also danger in specifying controlling behaviors independent of the management style that administrators employ. According to this line of thought, leadership style will help define the set of behaviors that may be effectively used by a particular administrator. Control-designed behaviors that are not congruent with the basic style of the administrator are not likely to be as efficacious as styles and behaviors that are aligned. Thus, behaviors may work for some school executives but not for others. This caveat takes on added significance when we recall that the control literature underscores directive behaviors, while administrators have traditionally employed extremely non-directive leadership styles, especially in managing the technical core.

Finally, researchers often specify a static and uniform definition of control. That is, certain activities of administrators are defined as controlling behaviors, independently of other behaviors in the system. Research conducted at the classroom level should lead researchers in the area of organizational control to view this assumption with a good deal of skepticism (see Brophy & Good, 1986; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984; Mitman, 1985). These studies lead to the following conclusion: controlling behaviors that have positive effects in one situation may have neutral or negative effects in others (see Murphy, Weil, & McGreal, 1986). This is the case for a number of reasons. First, behaviors must be mediated through specific task, classroom, and school situations. Other factors in a school may overcome the negative aspects of some behaviors or mitigate the positive effects of others (Firestone & Wilson, 1985). Second, activities may convey different meanings when they are interpreted individually than when they are viewed within the context of an array of behaviors (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984). Third, the meaning attached to actions will vary according to the intent with which they are empowered. That is, the same behavior can be undertaken for various purposes (see Allington, 1983; Eder, 1981; Schwartz, 1981, for examples at the classroom level). Fourth, subordinates have varying frameworks (e.g., past experiences) with which they decode the meaning of the actions of their superiors. In short, the "fit" (Duke, 1986) or the "congruence" (Lotto, 1983b) between the actions of the administrator and the perceptions of the teachers must be considered. Finally, the timing of controlling activities may alter both how they are perceived and the effects they have (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; Duke, 1986; Pitner & Ogawa, 1981).

Researchers in the area of control have been remiss in their failure to consider such issues as the specific task situations in which actions are performed, the interactions among behaviors, the various purposes for which activities are undertaken, the relationship between these actions and the perceptions of subordinates, and the timing of actions. These studies have also failed to specify the power of various behaviors in general or in relation to particular task situations. Finally, few examinations have been made of consistency of control-designed actions across interactions (Firestone & Wilson, 1985). At the micro level of analysis one can conclude that behaviorally-based research on organizational control in schools is a good deal more complex than acknowledged in the literature. Future investigations must begin to examine control with reference to how specific behaviors are interpreted within the total array of an administrator's actions.

Conclusion

So far we have touched on the growing interest in the topics of organizational control and professional empowerment in schools, reviewed findings about control from twelve IESD, and discussed some of the limitations of defining control primarily in behavioral terms and without reference to specific organizational contexts.

In concluding, it seems appropriate to make two observations or general notes. First of all, control and empowerment should not be viewed as opposites; neither should the larger concepts to which they are often tied--bureaucracy and professionalism. The current trend to treat bureaucracy as a fossil or scapegoat for the problems experienced by teachers in schools seems particularly wrongheaded. Bureaucratic structures

can empower professionals as well as control their behavior. On the other hand, those who believe that the control they find in the "effectiveness research" is the scaffolding upon which better schools should be built need to proceed with caution. What they see are structures and there are two important caveats they should keep in mind about these forms. First, forms and structures that appear to work in one setting may not transfer to others. More importantly, forms have not, do not, and never will determine organizational effectiveness. It is the substance that comprises the forms that must be examined. When I performed this analysis in our study of IESD I found a good deal of sensitivity to professionalism and autonomy embedded in the structures that appeared to be designed to control organizational activities (see also Firestone & Wilson, 1985b).

References

Allington, R. (1983, May). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading ability. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (5), 548-559.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1926). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. L. Witlock (Ed.) Third Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Campbell, A. (19__). Functions in flux.

Campbell, R. F. (1981, Winter). The professorship in educational administration--a personal view. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(1), 1-24.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Astuto, T. A. (1984, Summer). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 41-68.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17(1), 1-26.

Cohen, E. G., & Miller, R. H. (1980, October). Coordination and control of instruction in schools. Pacific Sociological Review, 23(4), 446-473.

Crowson, R. L., & Morris, V. C. (1984, April). Administrative control in large-city school systems: An investigation in Chicago. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Deal, T. E., & Celotti, L. D. (1977). "Loose coupling" and the school administrator: Some recent findings. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

DeBoise, W. (1982). The principal's role: How do we reconcile expectations with reality? Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Downs, A. (1967). Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Duckworth, K. (1983, July). Specifying determinants of teacher and principal work. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Duckworth, K. (1981, September). Linking educational policy and management with student achievement. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Duke, D. L. (1986, Winter). The aesthetics of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(1), 7-27.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984, February). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subtleties in the principal's role. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 32-37.

Eder, D. (1981, July). Ability grouping as a self-fulfilling prophecy: A microanalysis of teacher-student interaction. Sociology of Education, 54(3), 151-162.

Finn, C. E. (1983, June). Toward strategic independence: Policy considerations for enhancing school effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-79-0035)

Firestone, W. A. (1984, April). The study of loose coupling: Problems, progress, and prospects. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Firestone, W. A., & Herriott, R. E. (1982, December). Prescriptions for effective elementary schools don't fit secondary schools. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 51-53.

Firestone, W. A. & Wilson, B. L. (1985a, Spring). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(2), 7-30.

Firestone, W. A. & Wilson, B. L. (1985b, July). Management and organizational outcomes: The effects of approach and environment in schools. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Frymier, J. (1987, September). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Guzzetti, B., & Martin, M. (1986, April). A comparative analysis of elementary and secondary principals' instructional leadership behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Hannaway, J., & Sproull, L. S. (1979). Who's running the show? Coordination and control in educational organizations. Administrator's Notebook, 27(9), 1-4.

Hanson, E. M. (1981). Organizational control in educational systems: A case study of governance in schools. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), Organizational behavior in schools and school districts. New York: Praeger.

Holmes & Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Lortie, D. C. (1969). The balance of control in elementary teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), The semi-professions and their organization. New York: Free Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. C., Crow, G., & Prulman, S. (1983). The elementary school principal in suburbia: an occupational and organizational study. (Contract No. 400-77-0094). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Lotto, L. S. (1983a, Winter). Believing is seeing. Organizational Theory Dialogue, 3(1), 6-26.

Lotto, L. S. (1983b, Fall). Revisiting the role of organizational effectiveness in educational evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analyses, 5(3), 367-378.

Lutz, F. W. (1982). Tightening up loose couplings in organizations of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27(4), 653-669.

Marshall, H. H., & Weinstein, R. S. (1984, Fall). Classroom factors affecting students' self evaluations: An interactional model. Review of Educational Research, 54(3), 301-325.

Meyer, J. W., Rowan, B. (1975). Notes on the structure of educational organizations: Revised version, Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.

Miles, M. B. (1983, November). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 14-19.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984a, May). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Toward a shared craft. Educational Researcher, 13(5), 20-30.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984b). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mitman, A. L. (1985, April). Teachers' differential behavior toward higher and lower achieving students and its relation to selected teacher characteristics. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(2), 149-161.

Murphy, J. (1978). Professionalism and bureaucracy in a loosely coupled elementary school: A case of power gained and power lost or who ate the last piece of power pie. Unpublished manuscript.

Murphy, J. (1986, Winter). Essay Review of "Principals in action: The reality of managing schools" in Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(1), 125-128.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986, Summer). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. Journal of Educational Administration, 24(2), 213-236.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mesa, R. P. (1985, February). Strategies for coupling schools: The effective schools approach. NASSP Bulletin, 69(478), 7-13.

Murphy, J., Hull, T. R., & Walker, A. (1987, July-August). Academic drift and curriculum debris: Analyses of high school course-taking patterns and its implications for local policy makers. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19(4), 341-360.

Murphy, J., Peterson, K. D., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The administrative control of principals in effective school districts: The supervision and evaluation functions. The Urban Review, 18, (3), 149-175.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., & McGreal, T. L. (1986, September). The basic practice model of instruction. Elementary School Journal, 87(1), 83-95.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Weil, M., & Mitman, A. (1983, Fall). Instructional leadership: A conceptual framework. Planning and Changing, 14(3), 137-149.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., Lotto, L. S., & Miller, S. K. (1987, December). Barriers to implementing the instructional leadership role. Canadian Administrator, 27(3), 1-12.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985, Spring). School effectiveness: A conceptual framework. The Educational Forum, 49(3), 361-374.

Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A conceptual framework for the design of organizational control systems. Management Science, 25, 833-847.

Owens, R. G. (1984, April). American high school: Characteristics of organization and culture and their impact on the exercise of leadership by the principal. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Peterson, K. D. (1978). The principal's task. Administrator's Notebook, 26(8), 1-4.

Peterson, K. D. (1983, August). Mechanisms of administrative control in educational organizations: An exploratory study. Unpublished manuscript. Vanderbilt University.

Peterson, K. D. (1984a, April). The effect of district size on the use of hierarchical and non-hierarchical mechanisms of control. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Peterson, K. D. (1984b, December). Mechanisms of administrative control over managers in educational organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 573-597.

Pitner, N. J. (1986, Spring). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(2), 23-42.

Pitner, N. J. & Ogawa, R. T. (1981, Spring). Organizational leadership: The case of the school superintendent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17(2), 45-65.

Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Purkey, S. D. & Smith, M. S. (1983, March). Effective schools: A review. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 427-452.

Rowan, B. (1983, October). Instructional effectiveness in school districts: A conceptual framework. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Research and Development.

Schwartz, F. (1981, Summer). Supporting or subverting learning: Peer group patterns in four tracked schools. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12(2), 99-121.

Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982, February). Ten principles of quality leadership. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 330-336.

Sproull, L. S. (1981, Summer). Managing education programs: A micro-behavioral analysis. Human Organization, 40(2), 113-122.

Wimpelberg, R. K. (1986, April). Bureaucratic and cultural images in the management of more and less effective schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Wise, A. E. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press.